UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,595	09/29/2003	Atsushi Sakurai	1341.1162	8549

21171 7590 08/23/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
BOYCE, ANDRE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,595	SAKURAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre Boyce	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 25, 2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jenkins et al (US 2002/0188499).

As per claim 1, Jenkins et al disclose a computer program for realizing supply-demand planning in a supply chain (i.e., fulfillment system 100 allowing users to match flow of supply to demand by creating an optimal inventory strategy, ¶ 0013), the computer program making a computer execute: performing selectively one of a supply-demand planning per order (i.e., the planning component 210 generates planned orders to cover demand that occurs, ¶ 0048) and a supply-demand planning

based on total amount of orders (i.e., any demand that occurs within a period is aggregated together and met with a single planned order, ¶ 0048), depending upon switching information stored in correspondence to a base and an item in a table (i.e., depending on the source data, as seen in the source column, table 2, the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory, ¶¶ 0083-84).

As per claim 2, Jenkins et al disclose calculating and accumulating all amounts of orders for the item to obtain the total amount of orders (i.e., planning component 210 processes all demand for a SKU, ¶ 0039).

As per claim 3, Jenkins et al disclose a method of supply-demand planning in a supply chain (i.e., fulfillment system 100 allowing users to match flow of supply to demand by creating an optimal inventory strategy, ¶ 0013), the method comprising performing selectively, depending upon the-switching information stored in correspondence to a base and an item (i.e., depending on the source data, as seen in the source column, table 2, the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory, ¶¶ 0083-84), a supply-demand planning per order (i.e., the planning component 210 generates planned orders to cover demand that occurs, ¶ 0048) or a supply-demand planning based on total amount of orders (i.e., any demand that occurs within a period is aggregated together and met with a single planned order, ¶ 0048).

Claim 4 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 1, since it is the computer readable recording medium claim corresponding to the computer program claim.

As per claim 5, Jenkins et al disclose a computer program for making supply-demand planning for each base (i.e., destination and/or source, ¶ 0039) in a supply chain (i.e., fulfillment system 100 allowing users to match flow of supply to demand by creating an optimal inventory strategy, ¶ 0013) in which a plurality of bases are cascaded (i.e., higher level SKUs consisting of a plurality of source SKUs, ¶ 0039), the computer program making a computer to execute: processing a procurement-driven planning in which the supply-demand planning is made for a plurality of bases associated with an order unit (i.e., planning component 210 processes all demand for a SKU, including higher level SKUs that have a plurality of sources, ¶ 0039); processing a manufacturing-driven planning in which the supply-demand planning is made based on a total amount of orders for a specific base (i.e., the planning component adjusts scheduling based upon total shipments for a source, ¶¶ 0044-45); and making the supply-demand planning for the whole supply chain by selectively (i.e., depending on data, the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory, ¶¶ 0083-84) using one of the procurement-driven planning (i.e., the planning component 210 generates planned orders to cover demand that occurs, ¶ 0048) and the manufacturing-driven planning (i.e., any demand that occurs within a period is aggregated together and met with a single planned order, ¶ 0048) based on switching information that is stored with a combination of a base and an item (i.e., level of each SKU and planned arrivals/orders, ¶ 0039).

As per claim 6, Jenkins et al disclose a supply-demand planning system (i.e., fulfillment system 100 allowing users to match flow of supply to demand by creating an optimal inventory strategy, ¶ 0013) comprising: a table of orders, each order being directed to an item and an entity storing or producing the item within a supply chain, and including switching information indicating one of a procurement-driven supply-demand planning and a manufacturing-driven supply-demand planning (i.e., sourcing table in database 600, wherein planning component 210 determines a level for each SKU, including destinations and sources that replenish the SKU, ¶ 0039); and a planning unit that generates a supply-demand plan according to one of the procurement-driven supply-demand planning (i.e., planning component 210 processes all demand for a SKU, including higher level SKUs that have a plurality of sources, ¶ 0039) and the manufacturing-driven supply-demand planning depending on the switching information (i.e., the planning component adjusts scheduling based upon total shipments for a source, ¶¶ 0044-45).

As per claim 7, Jenkins et al disclose at least one of: a database storing data related to entities in the supply chain and items produced or stored therein (i.e., database 600, ¶ 0019); and a procurement-driven engine and a management-driven engine controlled by the planning unit to make the supply-demand plan (i.e., distribution module 200, ¶ 0027).

Response to Arguments

5. In the Remarks, with respect to claims 1-7, Applicant argues, that since Jenkins et al does not teach or disclose switching information, Jenkins et al therefore does not disclose the limitations of the claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the Examiner submits that the "switching information" in Applicant's invention seems to be a static designation of "1" or "2" as listed in a table, corresponding to either procurement-driven or manufacturing-driven, respectively (see Applicant's figure 3 and page 5, lines 16-20 of the specification). Similarly, Jenkins et al disclose a sourcing table in database 600, wherein depending on the source data (i.e., from the source column, table 2), the system uses one of two styles of aggregation forecast or inventory (¶¶ 0083-84). As such, the source data indeed equates to switching information, therefore Jenkins et al indeed teachings Applicant's claim limitations.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571) 272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

adb
August 17, 2007

ANDRE BOYCE
PATENT EXAMINER
AU 3623